



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,847	12/19/2001	Richard D. Kreckel	SBC 0108 PA	6132

7590 02/14/2005  
Robert P. Renke  
Suite 250  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER
----------

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/024,847

Applicant(s)

KRECKEL ET AL.

Examiner

Barry W Taylor

Art Unit

2643

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view of Driskell et al (6,072,493 hereinafter Driskell).

Regarding claims 1 and 12. Walter teaches a system and method of processing a plurality of call detail records (CDRs) each indicative of a call transaction on a telecommunication network (see all especially col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25) comprising:

receiving a plurality of CDRs at a first controller, each of the CDRs having a data structure including a plurality of fields containing at least one character (col. 2 lines 41-42, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25);

selecting a first sorting field from the plurality of fields and grouping the plurality of CDRs as a function of data within the first sorting field (col. 2 lines 44-47, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25);

analyzing a second sorting field within each of the CDRs within a group of CDRs sorted by the first sorting field (col. 2 lines 47-49, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25); and

generating a report for each of the grouped CDRs as a function of data within the second sorting field (col. 2 lines 49-52, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25).

According to Applicant (see paper number 4, Amendment “A”, dated 6/02/2004, last four lines on page 7 and second to last paragraph on page 8), Walter first groups according to time stamp verses Applicant’s amended independent claim language of first grouping according to carrier identification field. The Examiner notes that sorting by time then by carrier as evident by Walter verses sorting by carrier then by time (see Applicant’s amended independent claims 1 and 12) is a matter of design choice and is not novel to one of ordinary skill in the art of filtering call detail records.

Next, Applicant’s amend independent claims 1 and 12 to deliver customized carrier specific report to a user terminal (see amendments to independent claims 1 and 12, paper dated 10/21/2004).

Driskell teaches system and method for associating services information with selected elements of an organization (title, abstract, and col. 1 lines 12-48) enabling users having a corporation the ability to break down cost into service categories correlated to multiple service providers (col. 1 line 49 – col. 2 line 56, col. 3 lines 1-23, lines 40-48, lines 57-60, col. 6 lines 28-37, col. 6 line 52 – col. 7 line 4, col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 26, col. 9 lines 55-58, col. 10 lines 38-49, col. 11 lines 4-58, col. 12 lines 11-60, col. 13 lines 41-52, col. 14 lines 24-65, col. 15 lines 6-28, col. 16 line 32 – col. 18 line 9, col. 20 lines 64-66, col. 21 lines 19-30, col. 22 lines 24-32, col. 24 lines 34-50, col. 25 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 24-25, col. 26 line 58 – col. 27 line 58, col. 28 lines 7-14) so that corporation may be able to forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year or spread certain charges by selected percentages across elements, members or departments of the organization (col. 23 lines 1-52). Driskell teaches correlating calls/minutes/dollars for each NPA-NXX serviced by different service providers (col. 27 line 27-58).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Driskell into the teachings of Walter to associate service information from multiple service providers as taught by Driskell for the benefit of further breaking down cost into service categories correlated to multiple services providers enabling a corporation to accurately forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year.

Regarding claim 2. Walter teaches the plurality of CDRs are generated at a second controller (see 10 figure 1) remotely located from the first controller (see 16 figure 1) coupled to the telecommunication network.

Regarding claim 3. Walter teaches at least one of the plurality of fields includes a plurality of subfields (col. 3 lines 46-66).

Regarding claims 4, 16 and 20. Walter does not explicitly show the call transaction is a long distance calling card transaction. However, Walter discloses that other fields may be included (col. 3 line 57).

Driskell teaches system and method for associating services information with selected elements of an organization (title, abstract, and col. 1 lines 12-48) enabling users having a corporation the ability to break down cost into service categories correlated to multiple service providers (col. 1 line 49 – col. 2 line 56, col. 3 lines 1-23, lines 40-48, lines 57-60, col. 6 lines 28-37, col. 6 line 52 – col. 7 line 4, col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 26, col. 9 lines 55-58, col. 10 lines 38-49, col. 11 lines 4-58, col. 12 lines 11-60, col. 13 lines 41-52, col. 14 lines 24-65, col. 15 lines 6-28, col. 16 line 32 – col. 18 line 9, col. 20 lines 64-66, col. 21 lines 19-30, col. 22 lines 24-32, col. 24 lines 34-50, col. 25 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 24-25, col. 26 line 58 – col. 27 line 58, col. 28 lines 7-14) so that corporation may be able to forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year or spread certain charges by selected percentages across elements, members or departments of the organization (col. 23 lines 1-52). Driskell teaches correlating calls/minutes/dollars for each NPA-NXX serviced by different service providers (col. 27 line 27-58). Driskell also teaches call types of 3<sup>rd</sup> party, Calling Card, Custom Dialed,

Art Unit: 2643

Conference and Collect (see bottom left side of figure 5) correlated to different service providers including AT&T, BELLSOUTH, MCI, SPRINT, etc. (see bottom left side of figure 6).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Driskell into the teachings of Walter to associate service information from multiple service providers as taught by Driskell for the benefit of further breaking down cost into service categories correlated to multiple services providers enabling a corporation to accurately forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year.

Regarding claims 6 and 18-19. Walter teaches the second sorting field in an enhanced service (see col. 4 lines 23-25 wherein second sort field corresponds to call service and destination metric). Driskell also teaches call statistics relating to 3<sup>rd</sup> party, Calling Card, Custom Dialed, Conference and Collect calls (see bottom left side of figure 5) correlated to different service providers including AT&T, BELLSOUTH, MCI, SPRINT, etc. (see bottom left side of figure 6).

Regarding claim 7. Walter does not explicitly show receiving CDRs at daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly intervals.

Driskell teaches system and method for associating services information with selected elements of an organization (title, abstract, and col. 1 lines 12-48) enabling users having a corporation the ability to break down cost into service categories correlated to multiple service providers (col. 1 line 49 – col. 2 line 56, col. 3 lines 1-23, lines 40-48, lines 57-60, col. 6 lines 28-37, co. 6 line 52 – col. 7 line 4, col. 8 line 63 –

Art Unit: 2643

col. 9 line 26, col. 9 lines 55-58, col. 10 lines 38-49, col. 11 lines 4-58, col. 12 lines 11-60, col. 13 lines 41-52, col. 14 lines 24-65, col. 15 lines 6-28, col. 16 line 32 – col. 18 line 9, col. 20 lines 64-66, col. 21 lines 19-30, col. 22 lines 24-32, col. 24 lines 34-50, col. 25 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 24-25, col. 26 line 58 – col. 27 line 58, col. 28 lines 7-14) so that corporation may be able to forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year or spread certain charges by selected percentages across elements, members or departments of the organization (col. 23 lines 1-52). Driskell teaches correlating calls/minutes/dollars for each NPA-NXX serviced by different service providers (col. 27 line 27-58).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Driskell into the teachings of Walter to associate service information from multiple service providers as taught by Driskell for the benefit of further breaking down cost into service categories correlated to multiple services providers enabling a corporation to accurately forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year.

Regarding claims 8-10. Walter teaches using third sorting field (see CDR ANALYSIS section starting on column 5 line 35 wherein data indicative of call attempts).

Regarding claim 11. Walter teaches the report is a Trunk report (col. 1 lines 34-48, col. 3 lines 46-57, col. 4 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 11-35).

Regarding claim 13. Walter shows plurality of servers (see plurality of servers 18 figure 1).



Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claim 14. Walter shows plurality of remotely located clusters (see figure 1 wherein remote clusters 18 are remote from server 10).

Regarding claim 15. Walter shows master database (see 10 figure 1) in operative communication with each of the plurality of remotely located clusters (18 figure 1), the master database for storing each of the plurality of CDRs generated by each of the clusters.

Regarding claim 17. Walter teaches CDR fields comprise at least one of a call type, system failure, rate, method of recording, Message type or call statistics (see col. 4 lines 14-64, col. 8 lines 56-65). Driskell also teaches call types of 3<sup>rd</sup> party, Calling Card, Custom Dialed, Conference and Collect (see bottom left side of figure 5) correlated to different service providers including AT&T, BELLSOUTH, MCI, SPRINT, etc. (see bottom left side of figure 6).

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 872 9314,

(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2643

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor, telephone number (703) 305-4811, who is available Monday-Friday, 6:30am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached at (703) 305-4708. The facsimile phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Barry W. Taylor", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Barry W. Taylor  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2600  
Art Unit 2643